REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the May 7, 2007 Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22 and 29-33, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,914,695 issued to Walters, et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0196007 to Baron. The rejection asserts that Walters allegedly teaches each element of the claims except automatically mapping or examining a communication protocol, which is allegedly taught by Baron.

The claims are directed toward mapping a resident program to a peripheral device, either by identifying the peripheral device or if the device cannot be identified, then by the communication protocol specified by the peripheral device. Each of the independent claims require if the peripheral device is identified "automatically mapping from the identified peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs" and if the peripheral device is not identified "*examining a communication protocol specified by said peripheral device to automatically map to a corresponding one of said resident programs*." Thus, the peripheral device is automatically mapped to a resident program by either the identity of the resident device, or lacking a proper identity, examination of the communication protocol of the resident device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests looking to the communication protocol used by the peripheral device, and then automatically mapping a corresponding program. The office

action admits this is not taught by Walters. Baron teaches a system where if a driver for a peripheral device is not identified, then the device itself is searched to see if the driver exists on the device. Figure 2, steps 110-118 describe the system of Baron where the device itself is search for the driver. As stated in paragraph [0024]:

> At decisional step 110, if driver 60 does not reside in memory 52 of peripheral device 14, the method proceeds from step 110 to step 112, where operating system 26 may prompt a user to load or otherwise supply a driver corresponding to the peripheral device 14. If driver 60 does reside in memory 52 of peripheral device 14, the method proceeds from step 110 to step 114, where operating system 26 requests a copy of driver 60 from peripheral device 14. At step 116, computer 12 receives a copy of driver 60 from peripheral device 14 and stores the copy of driver 60 in driver library 30. At step 118, processor 20 loads or installs driver 60 to accommodate continued communications between computer 12 and peripheral device 14.

Thus, all Baron does is the peripheral device is not automatically mapped to a resident program is search the device itself for existence of the program. Nothing in Baron teaches or suggests examining the communication protocol. There is simply a request form the operating system to the peripheral device for a copy of the driver. Only the present invention teaches examining the communication protocol and mapping a resident program based on the results of that communication.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 29, 33 and 35-36.

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 29, 33 and 35-36, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 are likewise in condition for

allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated January 10, 2008   By: /James T. Hagler/
                                     James T. Hagler
                                     Reg. No. 40,631
                                     (858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502